



DIGEST NO. 644444444 - A & M

532

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540

170

Released

B-159084

MAY 11 1966

MAY 11 1966

Dear Senator Symington:

By letter dated April 28, 1966, you asked to be advised of any law or regulation that would permit the United States to pay a proposed street assessment, on a front-foot basis, to the City of St. Joseph, Missouri.

The United States Army Reserve Training Building at 1201 North 36th Street, St. Joseph, Missouri, occupies 388 feet of frontage on that portion of 36th Street that is to be paved. This paving is to be paid for by special tax bills assessed against all abutting property owners. The Department of the Army has advised the City of St. Joseph that there is no authority for the Army to participate in the cost of the proposed improvement.

It has long been the position of the United States that, absent specific legislation authorizing such, lands owned by the United States cannot be taxed by a State or subdivision thereof. For example, in our decision of July 17, 1947, 27 Comp. Gen. 295, we held that legal authority did not exist for the payment to the City of Burley, Idaho, of street assessments levied against United States property. In that decision we held:

"It is a well settled rule that lands owned by the United States cannot be taxed by a State or by any of the political subdivisions of a State. Van Brecklin v. Tennessee, 117 U.S. 151; United States v. Power County, Idaho, 21 F. Supp. 684; cf. Pacific Spruce Corp. v. Lincoln County, 21 F. 2d 506. This rule applies with equal force where the tax is a special tax or assessment for local improvements as well as in the case of a general property tax against lands owned by the United States. Lee v. Osceola and Little River Road Improvement District, 268 U.S. 643; Mullen Benevolent Corporation v. United States, 290 U.S. 89; United States v. Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District, 19 F. Supp. 740; 18 Comp. Gen. 562. Cf., also, People of Puerto Rico v. United States, 134 F. 2d 267. A special assessment is a tax within the rule precluding a State from taxing lands owned by the United States, because it is an exercise of the sovereign power of taxation and, like

769879 / 087513

S-159084

other taxes, is an involuntary exaction. See United States v. Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District,
362 F.2d 743, 10 AFTR2d 1401; Hager v. Reclamation District, 111 U.S. 701.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the act of November 6, 1965, Pub. L. 89-374, 79 Stat. 1304, authorizes executive agencies to install, repair, and replace sidewalks around federally owned or controlled buildings by reimbursement to States and political subdivisions. While one might argue that what has been authorized for sidewalks should apply equally to streets, the legislative history of the cited act precludes that argument.

Specifically, in floor debate on H.R. 9830, 89th Congress, the derivative source of Pub. L. 89-374, the following colloquy took place between Congressman Brooks, the Chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee, and Congressman Rogers of Colorado.

"MR. ROGERS of Colorado. * * * The city and county of Denver fix the streets under city ordinances. The abutting landowner has a responsibility to pay his proportionate share. My question is, would this authorize the Air Force to pay its part as the abutting landowner for the repair of that street?

"MR. BROOKS. I do not believe it would go that far * * *. This does not include streets. I believe this has no contemplation to include streets."

"MR. ROGERS of Colorado. * * * but I would like to know * * * was there any testimony or any suggestion to this committee that they also assume the responsibility that all other landowners may assume of their proportionate share of the repair of the street in front of the building?"

"MR. BROOKS. We did not get involved in streets. This is limited to sidewalks. We have no estimates on the cost of going into the construction of streets and the repair bills in connection therewith. I believe this would be beyond the realm of this legislation."

"We had no hearings to indicate that we should do this. We have no testimony to reflect the cost."

B-159084

"If the gentlemen would want to introduce legislation of that type, certainly we would be glad to consider it. But we want to have some cost figures and estimates that would enable us to testify before the House as to what the actual situation is a little more accurately than we could now."

See 111 Cong. Rec., September 20, 1965, 23499, 23500.

In further explanation of H.R. 9830, Congressman Brooks had the following to say:

"This legislation would authorize the repair and replacement of sidewalks around federally owned property. In most municipalities, sidewalks are provided by assessing the abutting property owners for the cost of constructing and maintaining the sidewalks. Under the doctrine of sovereign immunity, the local governments are prohibited from assessing the Federal Government for sidewalk maintenance. As a result, the buildings frequently go unrepainted and much-used sidewalks around Federal may become quite hazardous to the citizens of the community.

"There is no general authority under present law authorizing these repairs by the Federal Government. This bill would authorize the executive agencies to make arrangements for the necessary repairs and, if the work can best be performed by the local governments, the agencies would be authorized to enter into agreements to reimburse those governments for the work. This bill in no way infringes on Federal Government immunity, but does provide the means whereby the Federal Government can fulfill its proper role as a property owner."
Ibid.

As can readily be seen from the foregoing there was no general authority for the United States to honor city assessments for the construction and repair of sidewalks until the enactment of Pub. L. 89-344^X and the legislative history of that act clearly shows that authority to reimburse for street construction and improvement was not intended to be covered by Pub. L. 89-344.^X

Accordingly, we must advise that there is no statute or regulation that would authorize the United States to pay the street assessment

ANNAT
et sv2

525

vtinsoiJ dnarmtevoG
adnemsvonGf fsoof rof adnemaseeA

B-159084

contemplated. We regret that our reply cannot be more favorable but trust that the foregoing will assist you in answering the letter of April 20, 1966, from the Director of Public Works of the City of St. Joseph, Missouri.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WETZEL

Assistant Comptroller General
of the United States

The Honorable Stuart Symington
United States Senate

TAXES

State

Government immunity

Assessments for local improvements

252

and assessments made and received by the State or its political subdivisions
or by any other governmental unit, or by any agency or instrumentality of the State or
any such political subdivision, or by any person or persons acting under contract
with the State or any such political subdivision, shall not be subject to taxation.

JEWELL H. SMITH

Secretary of the Commonwealth
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Massachusetts State House
Boston, Massachusetts